

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12, 14-18, 29-37, and 43 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 10-12, 14, 29-33, and 43 are rejected. Claims 6-9, 15-18, and 34-37 are indicated as allowable. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-5, 10-12, 14, 29-33, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lind et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0152508A1), referred to herein as Lind.

Lind describes a method and a system for conducting a bingo game. In the method, a result displayed from the bingo game for a first card is a result that corresponds to a presentation "single bar," "7," "triple bar" of pay line 1 (paragraph 73). If a player simultaneously places a second card in play in the system, a result associated with that card may be shown by a plurality of symbols shown at a pay line 2 (paragraph 73).

Further, in this method, once the player covers a game-ending pattern, no further numbers are drawn (paragraph 86). The player, or players in the event of a tie, that first match a previously determined, game-ending pattern wins a must-go prize (paragraph 86).

In addition to the game ending pattern, additional designated patterns can be covered in order to win a bonus prize (paragraph 96). A jackpot bonus prize is paid in some games on a plurality of cards that match an upright letter "M" pattern (paragraph 96). Different patterns may pay the same prize (paragraph 96). In the instance where a covered card contains more than one winning pattern, only the pattern paying the highest prize may be claimed and paid (paragraph 96). This includes the game-ending pattern (paragraph 96). If a card contains both the game-ending pattern and another, higher paying pattern, the higher prize amount is paid and the game ends (paragraph 96).

Lind does not describe or suggest a method for conducting a wagering game as recited in

Application No.: 10/756,429 26 IGT1P208G/P-888G

claim 1. Specifically, Lind does not describe or suggest “determining a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to the sum of the individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array” as recited in claim 1.

Rather, in contrast, Lind describes displaying a result from a bingo game for a first card that corresponds to a first pay line (paragraph 73). If a player simultaneously places a second card in play, Lind describes showing a result associated with the second card by using a second pay line (paragraph 73). Lind also describes claiming only a pattern paying the highest prize in a case where a covered card contains more than one winning pattern (paragraph 96). If a card contains both a game-ending pattern and another, higher paying pattern, the higher prize amount is paid and the game ends (paragraph 96). Accordingly, a description of displaying the pay lines 1 and 2 for the two bingo cards, and a description of paying the highest prize in the case where a covered card has more than one winning pattern does not describe or suggest “determining a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to the sum of the individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array” as recited in claim 1. The two bingo cards of Lind do not describe or suggest the interim patterns as recited in claim 1 and as known to people of ordinary skill in the art.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully traverse the statement on page 5 of the Office Action. The statement describes “[d]etermining a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to the sum of the individual pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array (Paragraphs 73 and 76 disclose that the player can play several cards simultaneously, and that the multiple cards can be grouped and considered as one game, hence on game array, and that the results will be displayed simultaneously. Hence, the up to one interim pattern award from each card, if obtained, will be summed and provided to the player.)” Applicants respectfully submit that Lind does not describe or suggest the “determining a total

interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to the sum of the individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns” as recited in Claim 1. Rather, Lind describes displaying the first and second pay lines for the two bingo cards. Hence, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Lind.

Further, Applicants respectfully traverse the statement on page 2 of the Office Action. The statement explains, “Lind’s awarding only awarding the highest one of a potential plural winning patterns applies to *each* of the plurality of cards the player can play simultaneously. It would follow that if the player wins at least one interim pattern on each of several simultaneously played cards, that the player would effectively be awarded the sum of the interim pattern wins.” According to the M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the description of “[i]t would follow that” in the statement in the Office Action suggests that the recitation “determining a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to the sum of the individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player’s unique game array” of Claim 1 is not found either expressly or inherently in Lind. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Lind. Hence, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Lind.

Claims 2-5 and 43 depend from independent claim 1. When the recitations of claims 2-5 and 43 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5 and 43 are also patentable over Lind.

Moreover, Lind does not describe or suggest a method for conducting a wagering game as recited in claim 10. Specifically, Lind does not describe or suggest “configuring the gaming unit to determine a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to the sum of

individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array" as recited in claim 10.

Rather, in contrast, Lind describes displaying a result from a bingo game for a first card that corresponds to pay line 1 (paragraph 73). If a player simultaneously places a second card in play, Lind describes showing a result associated with the second card by using pay line 2 (paragraph 73). Lind also describes claiming only a pattern paying the highest prize in a case where a covered card contains more than one winning pattern that includes a game-ending pattern (paragraph 96). If a card contains both the game-ending pattern and another, higher paying pattern, the higher prize amount is paid and the game ends (paragraph 96). Accordingly, Lind does not describe or suggest "configuring the gaming unit to determine a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to the sum of individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array" as recited in claim 10. Hence, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is patentable over Lind.

Claims 11, 12, and 14 depend from independent claim 10. When the recitations of claims 11, 12, and 14 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11, 12, and 14 are also patentable over Lind.

Further, Lind does not describe or suggest a gaming unit as recited in claim 29. Specifically, Lind does not describe or suggest "the gaming unit controller being programmed to determine a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to the sum of individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player's unique game array" as recited in claim 29.

Rather, in contrast, Lind describes displaying a result from a bingo game for a first card that corresponds to pay line 1 (paragraph 73). If a player simultaneously places a second card in

play, Lind describes showing a result associated with the second card by using pay line 2 (paragraph 73). Lind also describes claiming only a pattern paying the highest prize in a case where a covered card contains more than one winning pattern that includes a game-ending pattern (paragraph 96). If a card contains both the game-ending pattern and another, higher paying pattern, the higher prize amount is paid and the game ends (paragraph 96). Accordingly, Lind does not describe or suggest “the gaming unit controller being programmed to determine a total interim pattern award amount for the player corresponding to the sum of individual interim pattern awards for the interim patterns matched on the player’s unique game array” as recited in claim 29. Hence, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is patentable over Lind.

Claims 30-33 depend from independent claim 29. When the recitations of claims 30-33 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 29, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 30-33 are also patentable over Lind.

Claims 6-9, 15-18, and 34-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not initialed the references in an Information Disclosure Statement submitted to the United States Patent Office on December 20, 2007. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner initial, besides each reference, that that reference is considered.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this

case. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (510) 663-1100.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Roger S. Sampson /

Roger S. Sampson
Registration No. 44314
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP